

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00701 01 OF 02 102201Z

66

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05 NSAE-00

PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ISO-00 SS-15

NSC-05 /061 W

----- 098662

P R 101800Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0019

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4988

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

CINCUSAREUR

CINCUSNAVEUR

CINCUSAFE

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

OFFICE OF PREPAREDNESS GSA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0701

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MPOL, NATO

SUBJ: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE

REF: A. USNATO 0575 (NOTAL)

B. STATE 008271 (NOTAL)

C. U.S. CONTRIBUTION TO THE FORMULATION OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE,
DEC 3, 1974 (NOTAL)

D. STATE 253125 (NOTAL)

BEGIN SUMMARY: MISSION BELIEVES DRAFT 1975 MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE
(REF A), WHEN SUPPLEMENTED BY US INPUT ON "NATO DEFENSE IN THE
LONG TERM," WILL PROMOTE US OBJECTIVES FOR IMPROVED ALLIANCE
CONVENTIONAL FORCES AND INCREASED COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS. DURING
FORTHCOMING DRC CONSIDERATION AND COMPLETION OF GUIDANCE DOCUMENT,
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00701 01 OF 02 102201Z

MISSION PROPOSES TO EMPHASIZE NEED FOR MORE SPECIFIC DIRECTIVES ON
FORCE IMPROVEMENT PRIORITIES AND COOPERATIVE ACTIONS BY
ALLIES. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON VIEWS ON DRAFT
GUIDANCE, MISSION-PROPOSED ACTIONS, AND PRIORITIES FOR

FORCE IMPROVEMENTS BY FEBRUARY 17. END SUMMARY.

1. DRAFT 1975 MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE SHOWS SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT OVER PREVIOUS VERSIONS, PARTICULARLY IN EMPHASIS IT PLACES ON CONVENTIONAL LEG OF TRIAD AND COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS. PRACTICAL IMPACT OF THIS IMPROVEMENT WILL SUBSTANTIALLY DEPEND ON DEGREE TO WHICH FINAL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT SETS OUT: A) MORE SPECIFIC STATEMENT ON PRIORITIES AND RESOURCE PLANNING FACTORS WHICH NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES (NMA'S) CAN USE TO DEVELOP APPROPRIATE FORCE PROPOSALS, AND B) CLEAR-CUT DIRECTIVES FOR IMPLEMENTING/MONITORING COOPERATIVE AND COMMON PROGRAMS, TO INCLUDE GREATER EMPHASIS ON REGIONAL FORCE PLANNING.

2. MISSION SUPPORTS WASHINGTON DESIRE FOR STRONG EMPHASIS IN FINAL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT ON REGIONAL FORCE PLANNING/REVIEWS OF DEFENSE PLANS, PARTICULARLY FOR MAJOR COOPERATIVE/COMMON AND SUPPLORTING PROGRAMS. DURING DEFENSE REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) COMPLETION OF DRAFT GUIDANCE PARA 45, MISSION WILL ASK THAT GUIDANCE SPECIFICALLY INVITE GREATER REGIONAL COORDINATION AMONG NATIONS AND NMA'S WHEN NMA'S FORMULATE FORCE PROPOSALS. TO EXTENT POSSIBLE, RESULTING FORCE PROPOSALS SHOULD INCLUDE DESIRED NATIONAL ACTIONS TO INCREASE DEFENSE COHESIVENESS AMONG ALLIES AS WELL AS NATIONAL FORCE IMPROVEMENTS.

3. MISSION WILL ASK DRC TO SPECIFY (IN DRAFT GUIDANCE PARA 45) ANNUAL REAL INCREASES IN NATIONAL DEFENSE SPENDING OF 3-5 PERCENT AS RESOURCE LIMITATIONS WITHIN WHICH NMA'S SHOULD DEVELOP PRIORITY ONE FORCE PROPOSALS. WHILE MISSION BELIEVES NMA'S MUST BEAR MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR DETERMINING FORCE IMPROVEMENT PRIORITIES, RECOMMEND DRAFT GUIDANCE PARA 45 SPECIFY LIMITATION ON PROPORTION OF FORCE PROPOSALS WHICH NMA'S PLACE IN PRIORITY ONE STATUS. REQUEST WASHINGTON VIEWS, TO INCLUDE PREFERRED FORMULA FOR LIMITING PRIORITY ONE FORCE PROPOSALS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00701 01 OF 02 102201Z

4. MISSION RECOMMENDS DIRECTING DRC ATTENTION TOWARD COMPLETING ABOVE IMPLEMENTATION-ORIENTED PORTIONS OF DRAFT GUIDANCE RATHER THAN PRECIPITATING LENGTHY DISCUSSIONS ABOUT EXISTING DRAFT LANGUAGE. AS A MINIMUM, HOWEVER, FOLLOWING AREAS APPEAR TO WARRANT CHANGE:

A) THE THREAT (PARA EIGHT): PORTION OF SECOND SENTENCE READING, "...AND THE COMBINATION OF NEW TECHNOLOGY WITH SUPERIOR THROW-WEIGHT MAY IN FUTURE GIVE THEM A STRATEGIC ADVANTAGE," IS IRRELEVANT TO MAJOR THRUST OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE. MISSION PROPOSES TO ASK DRC TO DELETE IT.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 00701 02 OF 02 102212Z

66

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05 NSAE-00

PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ISO-00 SS-15

NSC-05 /061 W

----- 098809

P R 101800Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0020

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4989

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

CINCUSAREUR

CINCUSNAVEUR

CINCUSAFE

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

OFFICE OF PREPAREDNESS GSA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0701

B) STRATEGIC BALANCE: TEXTS OF PARAS 11-13 DO NOT REPEAT NOT PRIMARILY RELATE TO STRATEGIC BALANCE; PARA ELEVEN (PARTICULARLY LAST SENTENCE) SEEMS TO RECAST THRUST OF PARA TEN WITH EXCESSIVE MASSIVE RETALIATION IMPLICATIONS. MISSION PROPOSES TO ASK DRC TO DELETE PARA ELEVEN AND PLACE PARAS TWELVE AND THIRTEEN AFTER EXISTING PARA EIGHT (SECTION ENTITLED "THE THREAT").

C) PURPOSE OF NATO FORCES: THIRD SENTENCE OF PARA FIFTEEN DUPLICATES MATERIAL MORE APPROPRIATELY COVERED IN PARA 23 AND SUGGESTS EXCESSIVE RELIANCE ON NUCLEAR ESCALATION. MISSION PROPOSES TO ASK DRC TO DELETE THIRD SENTENCE AND "UNCONTROLLABLE" FROM PENULTIMATE SENTENCE OF PARA FIFTEEN.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00701 02 OF 02 102212Z

D) WARNING OF WAR: IN MISSION VIEW, US CAN MAKE A STRONG CASE FOR ELIMINATING ALL SECTIONS DEALING WITH DURATION OF WARNING TIME. A SIMPLE REFERENCE TO CURRENT EDITION OF MC-161 WILL SUFFICE. ON USE OF WARNING TIME, MISSION PROPOSES TO EXPAND PARAGRAPH 17(A) TO INCLUDE POINTS IN

REF D. THIS NECESSITATES DELETION OF ENTIRE IS DRAFT TEXT
PARAS 17 TO 20, REPLACING WITH FOLLOWING: BEGIN QUOTE:

WARNING OF WAR.

WARNING OF WAR IS A CONTINUING PROCESS OF ASSESSING FROM
AVAILABLE POLITICAL AND MILITARY INDICATORS THE LIKELIHOOD
OF A WARSAW PACT DECISION TO ATTACK, AND OF THEIR PREPAREDNESS
TO DO SO. THIS PROCESS BEGINS WITH THE FIRST SIGNIFICANT
EVIDENCE WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED CONSISTENT WITH AN
EVENTUAL WARSAW PACT ATTACK; I.E., AND INCREASE IN THEIR
CAPABILITIES ABOVE THE NORMAL PEACETIME POSTURE. TWO
ELEMENTS OF THE PROCESS ARE INITIALLY IMPORTANT TO NATO
DEFENSE PLANNING:

(A) DURATION OF WARNING TIME. THIS IS DISCUSSED IN
DETAIL IN THE CURRENT EDITION OF MC-161.

(B) USE OF WARNING TIME. ALL AUTHORITIES, BOTH NATO
AND NATIONAL, CONCERNED WITH DECISION-MAKING IN TIME OF A
CRISIS, MUST RECOGNIZE THE ADVANTAGE WHICH THE AGGRESSOR MIGHT
GAIN FROM THE INITIATIVE. THEREFORE, AUTHORITIES MUST BE ABLE
AND WILLING TO MATCH A WARSAW PACT BUILD-UP STEP-BY-STEP WITH A
PRECAUTIONARY NATO COUNTER BUILD-UP, RATHER THAN WAITING FOR A
CLEAR SIGNAL THAT THE WP INTENDS TO ATTACK. THE EARLY AND
RESOLUTE DEPLOYMENT OF RESOURCES TO INCREASE READINESS AND
CAPABILITIES WILL ENHANCE BOTH DETERRENCE AND DEFENSIVE STRENGTH.
QND QUOTE.

E) NATURE OF ATTACK AND DEFENSE: IN COMBINATION, PARAS 22 AND 23
SUGGEST THAT NATO MUST ULTIMATELY MAKE A DECISION TO USE NUCLEAR
WEAPONS IF ATTACKED BY CONVENTIONAL FORCES. DRAWING FROM NATO AGREED
STRATEGY (MC 14/3) AND REF C, MISSION WILL ASK DRC TO REPLACE
PARA 23 WITH FOLLOWING: BEGIN QUOTE: NATO'S AIMS, THEREFORE,
ARE TO SURVIVE AND WITHSTAND THE INITIAL SHOCK OF ATTACK, AND
THEREAFTER TO PRESERVE OR RESTORE THE INTEGRITY OF THE NATO
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00701 02 OF 02 102212Z

AREA BY EMPLOYING SUCH FORCES AS MAY BE NECESSARY WITHIN THE
CONCEPT OF FORWARD DEFENSE. NATO CONVENTIONAL FORCES SHOULD BE
CAPABLE OF MAINTAINING A COHERENT CONVENTIONAL DEFENSE SO AS NOT
TO FORCE PREMATURE USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS. HOWEVER, THE
ALLIANCE MUST BE PREPARED TO USE ANY FORCE CAPABILITIES AT ITS
DISPOSAL, INCLUDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS, EITHER IN THE CONTEXT
OF DIRECT DEFENSE OR DELIBERATE ESCALATION, TO BRING HOME
TO THE OTHER SIDE WITH UNMISTAKABLE FORCE THE RISKS OF CONTINUED
AGGRESSION AND TO PROMOTE THE EARLY AND FAVORABLE TERMINATION
OF HOSTILITIES. END QUOTE.

F) MBFR: MISSION DOES NOT REPEAT NOT BELIEVE FINAL
GUIDANCE DOCUMENT SHOULD TASK NMA'S OR NATIONS WITH STUDIES ON
HYPOTHETICAL MBFR OUTCOMES. WE THEREFORE PROPOSE TO ASK DRC
TO DELETE PARA 31.

5. MISSION COMMENT: ABOVE CHANGES ARE THOSE WE CONSIDER
ESSENTIAL. DURING DRC DISCUSSIONS, MISSION WILL, OF COURSE,
SUGGEST NUMEROUS ADDITIONAL CHANGES TO MORE COMPLETELY
SQUARE FINAL DOCUMENT WITH US DESIRES. IN OUR VIEW, HOWEVER,
IMPLEMENTATION-ORIENTED ADDITIONS TO DRAFT GUIDANCE OUTLINED
IN PARA 1 ABOVE PROVIDE MOST PRODUCTIVE AREAS FOR WORK. END
COMMENT.BRUCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 10 FEB 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO00701
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750286/abbrzici.tel
Line Count: 227
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 0575 (NOTAL) B. STATE 008271 (NOTAL) C. U.S. CONTRIBUTION TO THE FORMULATION OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE, DEC 3, 1974 (NOTAL) D. STATE 253125 (NOTAL)
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by MartinML>; APPROVED <03 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE
TAGS: MPOL, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
USCINCEUR
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT
CINCUSAREUR
CINCUSNAVEUR
CINCUSAFE
MBFR VIENNA
OFFICE OF PREPAREDNESS GSA

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006